

**REMARKS**

Favorable reconsideration of this application in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claim 1-7, 9-15 and 17-25 are pending in the present application. No claims have been amended, canceled or added by the present amendment.

**35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejection**

Claims 1, 4, 5, 11-13 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Humpleman et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As noted in the previously filed response, independent claim 1 recites the command data transmitted to the external device includes commands for controlling the external device and in which the command data is initially stored in the memory of the audio/video apparatus and is not retrieved from the external device. Independent claim 13 includes similar features in the varying scope.

Thus, according to the present invention, a centralized approach is used (i.e., by storing the command/menus in one centralized location/memory 8 of the audio/video apparatus as shown in Fig. 1, for example). Therefore, with reference to Fig. 1, the present invention advantageously reduces the amount of transmissions required between the audio/video apparatus 100 and the external device 200 (i.e., the command/menus do not have to be “fetched” from each individual device prior to allowing the user to control the device).

Regarding this feature, the Office action indicates Humpleman et al. teach command data stored in the DHCP server and cites column 13, lines 20-60. However, it is respectfully noted Humpleman et al. must always retrieve the commands from the individual external device. That is, the commands are “fetched” from the individual external devices and then stored on the DHCP server. This differs from the present invention in which the command data is initially stored in the memory of the audio/video apparatus and is not retrieved from the external device. Thus, it is respectfully submitted the distributed approach Humpleman et al. does not correspond with the centralized approach of the present invention.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted independent claims 1 and 13 and each claim dependent therefrom are allowable.

**35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection**

Claims 9, 10, 17, 18, 21 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Humpleman et al. in view of Miller. This rejection is respectfully traversed.\

It is respectfully submitted this rejection has also been overcome as claims 9, 10, 17, 18, 21 and 22 are dependent claims and Miller also does not teach or suggest the features recited in the corresponding independent claims.

Claims 23-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Humpleman et al. in view of Miller and Dye. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Similar comments apply to independent claim 23 as that discussed above with respect to independent claims 1 and 13 regarding Humpleman et al. Miller also does not teach or suggest the features noted above. Further, the other claims 24 and 25 are dependent claims.

Accordingly, it is respectfully independent claim 23 and each of the claims depending therefrom are also allowable.

In addition, it is respectfully submitted the rejection of claims 2, 3, 14 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Humpleman et al. in views of Elsbree has also been overcome as these claims are dependent claims and Elsbree also does not teach or suggest the features recited in the independent claims.

**Conclusion**

For the foregoing reasons and in view of the above clarifying amendments, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw all of the objections and rejections of record, and to provide an early issuance of a Notice of Allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters which need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact David A. Bilodeau (Registration

No. 42,325) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and further replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: September 29, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By Esther Chong

Esther H. Chong

Registration No.: 40,953

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Rd

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant